

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

|  | APPLICATION NO.  | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
|  | 09/611,827   | 07/07/2000  | Mika Keski-Heikkila  | 2132-36PCON             | 6798             |
|  | To 11/03/2003  Lance J. Lieberman, Esq.  Cohen, Pontani ,Lieberman & Pavane Suite 1210  551 Fifth Avenue |             |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
|  |  |             |                      | D AGOSTA, STEPHEN M     |                  |
|  |  |             |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
|  |  |             |                      | 2683                    | 10               |
|  | New York, NY 10176   |             |                      | DATE MAILED: 11/03/2003 | 3                |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No. Applicant(s)  |   |                                     |
|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| Advisory Action  | 09/611,827  | KESKI-HEIKKILA ET   | AL.                                 |
| ·  | Examiner  | Art Unit  |                                     |
|  | Stephen M. D'Agosta   | 2683  |                                     |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe  | ars on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence addi  | ress                                |
| THE REPLY FILED 06 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to averinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.   | oid abandonment of this applica<br>a timely filed amendment which   | ation. A proper reply<br>n places the applicat                | to a<br>tion in                     |
| PERIOD FOR RE  | <u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]   |   |                                     |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing   | =   |   |                                     |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  | ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing   | g date of the final rejection                                 | on.                                 |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic firnely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C | If extension and the corresponding amo<br>the shortened statutory period for reply<br>be later than three months after the mail | unt of the fee. The appropriate originally set in the final ( | opriate extension Office action; or |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF   |   |   |                                     |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be  | ecause:   |   |                                     |
| (a)  they raise new issues that would require further  | er consideration and/or search (s   | see NOTE below);  |                                     |
| (b)  they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b  | elow);  |   |                                     |
| <ul><li>(c) they are not deemed to place the application in<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | n better form for appeal by mate  | rially reducing or sin  | nplifying the                       |
| (d)  they present additional claims without canceling  | ng a corresponding number of fi   | nally rejected claims   | <b>S.</b>                           |
| NOTE:  |   |   |                                     |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject   | ion(s):   |   |                                     |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | be allowable if submitted in a se   | eparate, timely filed a                                       | amendment                           |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See   |   | dered but does NOT  | Γ place the                         |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  | ause it is not directed SOLELY to   | o issues which were   | enewly                              |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we  |   |   | nd an                               |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |   |   |                                     |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |   |   |                                     |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |   |   |                                     |
| Claim(s) rejected: 1-10.   |   |   |                                     |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |   |   |                                     |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp  | roved by the Examir   | ner.                                |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer   |   | -   |                                     |
| 10. Other:   | 14/1  |   |                                     |
|  | WILLIAM 1   | rrost   |                                     |
|  | SUPERVISORY PAT   | ENT EXAMINER  |                                     |
|  |   |   |                                     |



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the prior art cited reads on the claimed invention. The invention focuses on a BTS addressing scheme that has fixed portion Beddoes discloses an invention that can use a unique ID for each BTS that is permanent (ie. town, city, area code, post office, etc.) which reads on the claim. Vendetti further address the claims by teaching a zone ID that is independent of a typical (eg. changeable) BTS ID which is permanent as well.